2010 CRDSP Annual Meeting Minutes

Pacific Grove, California

Tuesday February 23, 2010 through Wednesday February 24, 2010

BLM Attendees

Ashley Blythe, Miles City, MT

Allen Bollschweier, BLM NMSO

Signa Larralde, BLM NMSO

Penni Borghi, Cedarville , CA

Laurel Glidden, Cedar City, UT

Scott Goodman, Prineville, OR

Kirk Halford, BLM IDSO

William Hedman, Fairbanks, AK

Dan Martin, NSTC, WO 240

David Sisson, Cottonwood, ID

Monica Weimer, Royal Gorge, CO

Dan McGrew, Safford, AZ

Ardeth Hahn, Buffalo, WY

SHPO Attendees

Eric Allison (California)

Joan Dale (Alaska)

Karyn de Dufour (Nevada)

Rick Karl, Arizona (AZSITE)

Glenda King (idaho)

Damon Murdo (Montana)

Mary Sullivan (Colorado)

Tuesday 2/23/2010

Meeting called to order (8:30)

Introductions

Special Achievement Awards

ACHP and Secretary Awards Presented

Orientation

Kirk presented a brief overview of the CRDSP Mission, Goals, and Business Plan

Updates From The States

Idaho – SHPO is considering adopting the BLM Cottonwood GIS tools.

California – OHP (SHPO) is revising their internal data processes. The BLM Cedarville is creating an assistance agreement with the Northeast Information Center by which data exchange will occur (with some funding support for the Information Center). The hope is this will serve as a model for the other ten information centers in California.

Alaska – Data entry tools for GIS and database for BLM are planned for deployment in the next month. BLM has been working with OHA (SHPO) to formulate goals. This has led to a re-assessment of how BLM and OHA work together. A user forum will be held in Anchorage next month to start this assessment. Joan reports that they are ten years behind in information entry but this is rarely seen as a problem in Alaska. OAHP management did not think that accepting digital data should be a priority. Robin Mills in BLM has been directly entering data in the OAHP system. Management at OAHP does not seem keenly interested in dealing with backlog.

New Mexico – The SHPO will be implementing a new automated system that will have greater value for the BLM. The SHPO currently has a large backlog that is hampering work in the oil and gas field offices. These offices have created shadow systems to handle their daily needs. Long-term, New Mexico would like to assist the SHPO in making the data current and keeping it current. Alan says that the latency issues in the SHPO have been very destructive to the support for the SHPO system. New Mexico does have a strong program of desktop GIS for all BLM staff. Alan characterized the current mode as "federated" – meaning that there are no single standards for the field office data. Instead data transformers are used to create standardized data. These tools transform varying data formats to consistent formats. The 120 day workflow in oil and gas field offices is the big driver for change in the offices. New Mexico thinks of its users in BLM within two categories – viewers and editors. The former get a data portal, including an e-manager library of data layers that can be dragged and dropped conveniently.

Arizona – Upgrades to web site and other systems have proceeded including incorporation of satellite imagery. AZSITE has been digitizing at each BLM field office to update them. Hope to have 2 of the 3 field offices done by the end of this calendar year. Also, larger users are being

given direct access to the database and system as a whole. There is a backlog of about two years on the electronic information? The maps are current within a month (paper maps)? , but this is being addressed (need more info on this?). Dan says that his field office is about four years behind on the internal inventories done by BLM staff themselves.

Colorado – A lot of attention has been focused on eliminating the backlog at OAHP. So, the SHPO currently runs about a month behind the main office in terms of data entry. The office is moving to a new building during the next 18 months. The servers have already moved to the new location, so users are not seeing a disruption. Colorado actually enters the paper records right now – they touch every piece of paper. On the BLM side, the COSO lead has been able to sequester the CRDSP funds in the budget successfully. The BLM move to EGIS is a positive, though the network is pretty slow when you use GIS. New staff in the offices have helped to change the use of GIS too. For instance, BLM is starting to use the SHPO table structure for the GIS attribute tables. The COSO lead has said he will inform field offices that do not comply with data-sharing that their office risks de-certification under the state protocol.

Nevada – Continued upgrade of data and standardizing geodatabase standard. So at a minimum there will be a NVCRIS geodatabase format in which all data will be sent to BLM and SHPO. This summer, the new ArcGIS Server will (one hopes) turn on the map service so that BLM can directly use the map service in ArcMap. BLM firewall issues will be "interesting".

Utah – One of the issues seems to be access to the data. Laurel thinks the problem is that the data channel is slow, connections break. There may be a resolution by housing the state (AGRC / UDSH) data on the BLM CITRIX server to increase performance. UDSH (SHPO) has updated the online client – slated for release late this spring.

Montana – All data sharing agreements are signed (Montana and the Dakotas). Damon reports that the Miles City Field Office is being caught up on digitizing with energy act funds. This will be used to create an on-line mapping application. The SHPO would like new data to come in a digital format so that it can be integrated easily. The site files are all up to date and all records have been put in to PDF format. The inventories are not being scanned. Everything is going in to GIS. So, the Miles City Field Office is being used as the model for digitizing all of the field offices. For instance, all of the field offices were supposed to create digital data during their RMP process. The USFS would like access to the SHPO database but at this point they have not yet offered forward their funding.

Wyoming – Main thing is getting people up to speed on the BLM side with using their equipment. This includes the contractor's use of GPS.

Oregon – Support (acceptance) from the State Office level is still uncertain. There are over 20,000 resources and 15,000 inventories in the current system. Yet, it is still seen as "partial" or provisional. There is a functional ArcIMS system that uses the centrally-hosted data but it is probably not utilized as much as it should be. This map service will be converted to an ArcGIS Server application in the near future. There is little unanimity in Oregon!

Common themes of these presentations:

- backlog elimination;
- digital data creation from the start (create once)
- assistance agreements that are less open-ended about data products and include requirements about attending the annual meeting (perhaps by having BLM directly pay state employee travel costs)
- the awards are useful validation of the effort at the local level
- are there GPS data dictionary standards (question from Arizona, but of general interest)
- continually having to prove value is painful
- annual meetings?

BREAK OUT Group – BLM

How many of you are working closely with a GIS professional in your state? This was a goal from last year. There was a general consensus that this goal has not been met yet.

Problems:

Best Practices and Getting on The Radar At The Right Level

Cultural resources data management is not "validated" at the state office level. Going to the state office results in a need for permissions and may fail.

Typically, the successful efforts are work-flow based, and thus start at the field office because that is where the work actually gets done. So, for instance, David has been successful in the GIS realm because it has happened first at the local level. The local person then took this to the state level.

The geospatial strategic plan (ref. Bob Bewley) is a work in progress. The team meets every 6 months for tasks. Cultural resources data management needs to find its way in to the GSSP (geospatial strategic plan) process.

- As data stewards, pair with a field office GIS person to resolve workflow issues – internal and data sharing
- Have the local GIS person become your spokesperson within their state organization
- At the national level, get cultural in the GSSP process (next meeting April 26 to 30, Phoenix).
- Also get folks in front of the appropriate MEDS folks. Follows on from GSSP and connects to Field Committee.

Interim steps:

Draft a document that serves as a "best practices" guide for GIS and data management use within the field offices. This may involve an 8110 manual update to include these best practices:

- Who is the audience: field office cultural resource specialists and managers (but anyone might find it valuable)
- Part of the document must address why this is useful
- Spell out the data management goals for the specialist
  - It's corporate data
  - Easy to share
  - Efficient

?? This group formed a sub-team to draft such a document.

Within each state, we need to get in front of the state management team and ELT. This is really important because the managers really don't know anything about these programs.

Action item: talk with Bob Bewley about having a GSSP person sit in the CRDSP.

Annual Meeting

Annual meeting – unanimous yes.

Sharing Data – Transmitting The Essentials At The State Level

Core transmittal / content standards for sending and receiving records between BLM and SHPO

- For resources
- For surveyed space
- For other investigations

Creating Common GPS Data Dictionaries At The State Level

Can the BLM Data Representatives in each state help to create a core GPS data dictionary for her/his state? The CRDSP web site contains contributed data dictionaries. The purpose of this item was to advocate that data representatives make everyone in their state aware of available and useful data dictionaries. Also the data representatives will upload their dictionary to the CRDSP library.

Concept Paper for Green Initiatives

The group discussed having some form of proposal in hand for the various green initiatives. The folks with serious funding are the National Landscape Conservation System.

Straw Poll

PDFs of Resource Records

PDFs of Reports (Studies, Inventories, etc.)

GIS of Resource Location / Boundary (w/simple attributes)

GIS of Inventoried Space (w/simple attributes)

GIS of APE / Undertaking Boundary

Extensive Data Tables on Resources

SHPO Breakout Session

- **Annual Meeting**: Unanimous that we should continue. Travel issues can be dealt with using set aside BLM funds. Benefit of getting away from the office – freeing up ones' mind, sidebar discussions valuable. Locations should be pleasant enough that they don't detract from meeting.

- **Funding** – Budget issues hamper system development. Getting match for HPF funds – states don't necessarily provide (MT, CO). Charging for access / subscriptions (for some). Partnerships getting CRDSP-like financial support – multi-agency support. Administrative challenges for fees can exist, but being overcome. Service fees, charging for value-added service - need to keep option for "free", drop-in access as fallback. System maintenance, uptime, keeping paper as backup / fallback.

- **Fee Comparison** – What each SHPO office (or their affiliate) charges for access / subscriptions. Agreement to provide update and post to CRDSP site. Damon will circulate template, Rick will consolidate. Variations in what is charged for, how much – different models exist. Charging by area gets around incentive to not record things to avoid higher costs. Some charge for incoming, some don't.

Accomplishments:

- Has helped all states with funding towards digitization / automation goals.

Needs / Goals:

- SHPO involvement / dialog with BLM data reps – not always good, varies over time. Need to improve and stabilize. Technical connectivity / use issues as well. Meeting attendance, communication with SHPO counterpart – annual meeting with BLM lead / SHPO in state.
    - o Progress reports on state goals – incentive to meet / communicate
    - o Place in protocols

- BLM Data Reps not always in a position to get field office / archaeologists on board. Would benefit from getting GIS specialists and others with needed support skills engaged. BLM folks don't always know what's available. BLM field staff don't necessarily use SHPO datasets – sometimes concerned over data accuracy / quality. Concern over SHPOs having to provide tech or other support for BLM folks instead of BLM supporting.
    - o Training on SHPO system use
    - o Include SHPO system use in state protocol

- o Ongoing technical support from BLM data rep

- Related to previous – getting broader BLM support, buy-in, use of GIS tools / standards – potential use beyond cultural resources strengthens support of systems.

- Need reliable funding - backlogs to deal with, variations in funding lead to cyclical backlog problems. Data quality, data checking – correcting incoming data needs funding (subscriptions / fees).
  - o SHPOs to promote support / success of CRDSP
  - o Some state agencies' (e.g. DOTs) funding could be pursued

- Having BLM GIS technical lead for CRDSP – understand the technical issues, some understanding of CRM / archaeology. Involved / knowledgeable at national level (ideally). Cross-discipline involvement as well (not just CRM). Get this group more integrated with other disciplines and agencies.
  - o Invitation to GSSP

- Better sharing of experience in developing systems between partners (SHPO and BLM) – goal of avoiding problems / overcoming issues.
  - o Include lessons learned / what failed as well as successes in round-robin
  - o SHPOs to have separate conference calls

- Expanding CRDSP to multi-agency, better-funded partnership. Systems that meet the needs of other agencies will prove the CRDSP model works. Burden shouldn't just be on BLM, need ways to get other agencies' support. Lead by example. Also applies internally to SHPO offices (cross-program support needed).

  - o Market SHPO systems that work!

Action Items From The Breakout Sessions

SHPO items

- o Item: Data Representatives and SHPO Reps need better communication
  - Annual Meeting – SHPO, GIS Lead, State Lead
  - Both parties (data rep and SHPO) need to attend the CRDSP.
  - Make the mid-year conference call a goals reporting call so you have to meet or have some other incentive or deadline
  - Write the meetings in to the state protocols so they have to take place
- o Item: Data reps not always able to get field office staff using the tools worked out at the state level.

- Create through best practices memoranda
- Have state leads make the role of the data representative clear to the state management team and the state office cultural lead.
- Item: BLM staff don't know what's available and can't get sufficient technical help through their own offices. Also, BLM staff may rely on SHPO too much for technical support.
  - Require trainings and data use through the various protocols
  - The data representative needs to be the "go-to" person for support
- Item: SHPO funding needs to be more reliable and consistent.
  - No identified solution
  - Possibly DOTs
- Item: Bring a BLM GIS person in to the CRDSP to tie the CRDSP to the broader technical community in the agency
  - Approach through the geospatial strategic plan group (GSSP)
- Item: Better sharing of experiences in developing systems between partners
  - Post work process through the CRDSP web site
    - What did we try last year that did not work?
    - SHPO conference call
- Item: Create multi-agency partnerships
  - SHPOs need to market their systems

BLM Items

- Item: Best Practices and Getting on The Radar At The Right Level
  - As data stewards, pair with a field office GIS person to resolve workflow issues – internal and data sharing
  - Have the local GIS person become your advocate within BLM's GIS community at the state level
  - At the national level, get cultural in the geospatial strategic plan (GSSP) process (next meeting April 26 to 30, Phoenix).
  - Also get folks in front of the appropriate MEDS folks. Follows on from GSSP and connects to Field Committee.
  - Draft a document that serves as a "best practices" guide for GIS and data management use within the field offices. This may involve an 8110 manual update to include these best practices:
    - Who is the audience: field office cultural resource specialists and managers (but anyone might find it valuable)
    - Part of the document must address why this is useful
    - Spell out the data management goals for the specialist
      - It's corporate data
      - Easy to share
      - Efficient
    - Form a subteam
      - Bill (Chair)

- Monica
- Ashley
- Scott
  - o Consider amending the 8110 manual to include information management, digital data management
  - o Within each state, we need to get in front of the state management team and ELT. This is really important because the managers really don't know anything about these programs.
    - ▪ Briefing paper
  - o Talk with Bob Bewley about having a GSSP person sit in the CRDSP.
- Item: Sharing Data – Transmitting The Essentials At The State Level
  - o SHPO and BLM meet to agree upon the key information needs
    - ▪ Spatial data
    - ▪ Tabular data
    - ▪ PDF data
  - o SHPO (and BLM) promote standard with other submitters / contractors
  - o BLM may help to enforce through permitting standards
- Item: Creating Common GPS Data Dictionaries At The State Level (Within BLM)
  - o See national standard for GPS – (8100 manual): +/- 12m average error
  - o BLM data reps within each state could identify "good" data dictionaries
    - ▪ Share and revise with colleagues
    - ▪ Gain agreement that all will use same basic dictionary

Wednesday 2/24/2010

Budgets and Funding

Kirk updated the group on funding. This year's funding is a struggle, as always. There is a complicated mix of programs that hold the various funds. In the past, the advice was not to put dollars in to 1050; however, this may be changing and the CRDSP monies may (for the first time) be held in the 1050 account.

There was discussion about how to best ensure that travel funding gets preserved and that field office work effort funds are not used to adjust other budgets. For SHPOs, it may be easiest to work this through a contract task with Gnomon, in which a travel allotment is contracted and Gnomon pays travel and then bills against that task.

Kirk recommended that BLM funds (e.g., work time, travel for BLM staff) be kept at the state office. If it goes down to the field office, then it should do so with the knowledge of the state cultural lead, the field office manager, and the state budget lead.

Kirk reminded everyone that (1) they are part of a statewide effort in their states and also part of a national effort. The mantra, and goal, and success story is that the partnership saves money and time.

AZSITE Document Serving (Rick Karl)

Arizona had a problem with over 51 repositories of information. The Governor designated the Arizona State Museum as the repository, prior to the SHPO participating in the Consortium (as it was then called).

The Consortium was changed to a Board when AZSITE became the official electronic data repository in a governor's order of 2006.

Most major agencies send copies to AZSITE or simply rely upon AZSITE. State, county, municipal lands are all required to have their records stored in AZSITE.